



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,953	06/24/2003	Naveed Mirza	CS21214RL	1085
20280	7590	08/27/2007	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC			NGUYEN, HUY D	
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45				
ROOM AS437				
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/602,953

Applicant(s)

MIRZA ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-17 and 19-22 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 18 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/4/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicants submitted that Chadha does not disclose or suggest a housing having an exterior, the exterior including a first face side and a second face side, the second face side located on an opposite side of the housing from the first face side, a numeric keypad disposed on the first face side, and a text keypad disposed on the second face side, as recited in independent claim 1. The examiner directs the applicants to figures 1, 2, and 9 where the preceding limitations are taught.

The applicants also submitted that Chadha does not disclose or suggest a unitary housing including a first face side and a second face side, the second face side facing an opposite direction from the first face side, a user interface including a numeric keypad disposed on the first face side, and a text input device disposed on the second face side, as recited in independent claim 12. The examiner directs the applicants to figures 1, 2, and 9 where the preceding limitations are taught.

The applicants also submitted that Chadha does not disclose or suggest a candy-bar style housing having a first face side and a second face side, the second face side on an opposite side of the housing from the first face side, means for inputting numbers coupled to the first face side, and means for inputting text coupled to the second face side, as recited in independent claim 21. The examiner directs the applicants to figures 1, 2, and 9 where the preceding limitations are taught.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7, 12-15, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chadha (US 2004/0229662 A1).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 21-22, Chadha teaches a mobile communication device, comprising: a housing having an exterior, the exterior including a first face side (see figures 1 & 2) and a second face side, the second face side located on an opposite side of the housing from the first face side (see figure 9); a first display disposed on the first face side (see figures 1 & 2); a numeric keypad disposed on the first face side (see figures 1 & 2); a second display disposed on the second face side (see figure 9); and a text keypad disposed on the second face side (see figure 9).

Regarding claims 2, 14, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, wherein the numeric keypad comprises a telephone keypad and text keypad comprises a QWERTY keypad (Figs. 1, 2, 9).

Regarding claim 3, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, wherein the housing comprises a candy bar phone style housing (Figs 1 & 2).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 4, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, wherein the second display comprises a display configured to display at least one line of text (see figure 9).

Regarding claim 5, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, further comprising a speaker disposed on the first face side, the speaker located on a first side of the first display, and a microphone disposed on the first face side, the microphone located on a second side of the first display (Figs. 1 & 2).

Regarding claims 6, 13, 15, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, further comprising: a user interface including the numeric keypad, the user interface also including at least one mobile communication device input device; and a controller (e.g., cell phone microprocessor) coupled to the user interface, the first display, the second display, and the text keypad, the controller configured to receive signals from the user interface and activate and deactivate the text keypad based on the signals received from the user interface (Figs. 1, 2, 9,12).

Regarding claim 7, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1, wherein the text keypad is operated in a position orthogonal to a position of numeric keypad operation (Figs. 1, 2, 9,12).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha in view of King et al. (US 2004/0067770 A1).

Regarding claims 8, 16, Chadha does not teach the mobile communication device according to claim 1, further comprising a third display disposed on the second face side, wherein the third display is configured to display at least one line of text. However, the preceding limitation is taught in King et al. (see paragraph [0104]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of King et al. to the teaching of Chadha to provide more convenience for users.

6. Claims 9, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha in view of Rydbeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,487).

Regarding claims 9, 17, Chadha teaches the mobile communication device according to claim 1 except wherein the second display substantially surrounds the text keypad disposed on the second face side. The preceding limitation is taught in Rydbeck et al. (see figure 7A). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Rydbeck et al. to the teaching of Chadha to save space.

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Chadha in view of Rydbeck et al. teaches the portable phone according to claim 12, wherein the text input device comprises a touch screen (see Rydbeck et al.: figs 1 & 2).

7. Claims 11, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadha in view of Srey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,436).

Regarding claims 11, 20, Chadha teaches the claimed invention except an input lock button coupled to the third side, the input lock button configured to selectively lock and unlock

Art Unit: 2617

input functionality of the numeric keypad and the text keypad. Srey et al. teaches a keypad lock key (see column 1, lines 34-36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Srey et al. to the teaching of Chadha to improve security. Even though Chadha and Srey et al. do not teach that the input lock button coupled to the third side. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the input lock button coupled to the third side since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 10 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 10 and 18, the cited prior arts fail to teach the mobile communication device according to claim 9, wherein the second display is configured to display scrolling text by scrolling the text around the text keypad disposed on the second face side.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**JEAN GELIN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
Huy D Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2617

